

GRADING RUBRIC

Dr. Walter Dorn, 5 December 2016

The following grading rubric is modified from the one I use in the Joint Command and Staff Programme (JCSP) of the Canadian Forces College.

“Rubrics are a simplified way to grade student deliverables and participation and help [instructors] decide what mark a student should receive for his/her effort. Rubrics save time and facilitate the objective assignment of marks. More important than these two reasons, however, is that when rubrics are presented to the students beforehand it tends to result in the submission of better-quality work.” (Syllabus, JCSP)

For the Quest University course, the conversion of letter and percentage grades is done as follows:
A (87%–), A- (80–86%), B+ (77–79%), B (74–76%), B- (70–73%), C+ (67–69%), C (64–67%), C-(60-63%), etc.

There standards for written work (e.g., essays) and presentations/discussions are as follows.

Academic Written Work (Essays)

	A	B	C	F
Argument (45%)				
Organization	Essay proceeds logically from start to finish and is coherent through-out.	Essay includes some minor logical inconsistencies, but they hardly detract from the overall coherence of the argument.	Significant logical inconsistencies in parts of the paper make the overall credibility of the argument somewhat dubious.	The essay is illogical, incoherent, and as a result completely unconvincing.
Thesis Quality	Thesis, whether implicit or explicit, is absolutely clear and highly original.	Thesis, whether implicit or explicit, is clear and deliberate.	Thesis is identifiable in some form, with effort.	Essay does not contain — either implicitly or explicitly — a thesis.
Objectivity	Essay demonstrates a masterful grasp of all sides of the issue.	Essay effectively recognizes a variety of points of view.	Essay is clearly, albeit unintentionally, partial. It either fails to deal with contrary points of view out of ignorance or deals with them unfairly.	Essay is deliberately not impartial. The author has used the paper as a pulpit instead of as a framework for rigorous critical analysis.
Analysis	Analytical abilities on display are clearly superior and reflect an originality of thinking.	Analytical abilities on display demonstrate an ability to separate ideas into their component parts.	Analytical abilities on display are inconsistent. Some ideas are clear and fully understood; others are not.	Paper reproduces arguments from other sources with no evidence of understanding.

Evidence (30%)				
Depth	Essay draws from sources that represent the best primary (if applicable) and most comprehensive secondary information on the subject. Quantity of sources exceeds expectations.	Essay draws from a legitimate variety of primary (if applicable) and relatively comprehensive secondary information. Quantity of sources meets or exceeds expectations.	While the essay may draw from a significant number of sources, the information obtained from those sources is largely surface-level (for example, encyclopaedia entries and/or newspaper articles)	Essay is drawn largely, if not exclusively, from inappropriate material.
Breadth	Essay draws from an impressive variety of sources and perspectives.	Essay draws from an acceptable variety of sources and perspectives.	Sources either come largely from a single perspective or are quantifiably insufficient to meet the demands of the assignment.	Sources are excessively limited in quantity and represent an excessively limited point of view.
Synthesis	Presentation of the evidence demonstrates a masterful understanding of its themes, both specific and general.	Presentation of the evidence demonstrates a clear understanding of its themes, both specific and general.	Presentation of the evidence demonstrates a flawed understanding of either its specific or general themes.	Presentation of the evidence demonstrates a flawed understanding of both its specific and general themes.
Relevance	Evidence is directly applicable to the analysis throughout.	Evidence is largely applicable to the analysis throughout.	Some of the evidence is clearly tangential and detracts from the credibility of the argument.	Evidence does not contribute to a fulfillment of the goals of the assignment.
Writing (15%)				
Overall	Grammar, punctuation, and spelling are virtually flawless. Language and word choice are appropriate throughout.	Limited flaws in grammar, punctuation, and/or spelling do not detract from the overall message of the essay. Some minor problems with language and word choice are noted but not overly problematic.	Significant flaws in some of grammar, punctuation, spelling, language and/or word choice.	Paper is incoherent because of flaws in grammar, punctuation, spelling, language, and/or word choice.
Format (10%)				
Overall	Essay follows CFC scholarly conventions including proper citation methods virtually flawlessly.	Only minor flaws in terms of CFC scholarly conventions including citation methods.	Significant flaws in terms of CFC scholarly conventions (likely including citation methods).	Paper displays a blatant disregard for CFC scholarly conventions.

Class Participation, Presentation and Other Activities

(in addition to the analytical criteria presented in the written evaluation)

	A	B	C	F
Participatory Contribution (40%)				
Relation to Peers	Displays leadership in actively supporting, engaging and listening to peers (ongoing).	Actively supports, engages and listens to peers (ongoing).	Limited interaction with peers.	No interaction with peers.
Participation	Displays leadership in playing an active role in discussions (ongoing).	Plays an active role in discussions (ongoing).	When/where prepared, participates constructively in discussions.	Never participates.
Intellectual Contribution (30%)				
Preparation	Arrives fully prepared, having also done additional readings.	Arrives fully prepared.	Arrives noticeably less than entirely prepared.	Unprepared.
Delivery	Communicates ideas with some enthusiasm, proper voice projection, appropriate language and clear delivery while making some eye contact. Excellent use of audiovisual presentations.	Communicates ideas clearly. No significant delivery problems. Good use of audiovisual presentations.	Some difficulty communicating ideas due to problems with voice projection, language, or lack of eye contact. Weak use of audiovisual presentations.	Ideas are not clear. Poor use of audiovisual presentations.
Quality of Comments	Comments advance the level and depth of the dialogue (consistently).	Comments occasionally advance the level and depth of the dialogue.	When/where prepared, makes relevant comments based on the assigned material.	Demonstrates a noticeable lack of interest in the material.
Overall Impact (30%)				
Impact on Group Dynamic	Group dynamic and level of discussion are consistently better because of the student's presence.	Group dynamic and level of discussion are often better because of the student's presence.	Group dynamic and level of discussion are occasionally better (and never worse) because of the student's presence.	Group dynamic and level of discussion are harmed (perhaps significantly) by the student's presence.